



Water Bladder with Distribution Kits
SOL-OAA-16-000066
AMENDMENT I

Please note the following change to Closing Date:

(1) On the cover sheet, next to, “Closing Date:” delete ~~May 10, 2017~~, and insert ~~May 12, 2017~~.

Note that the closing date has been changed from 5/10/2017 to 5/12/2017.

Responses to Questions

- 1) The term is 5 years, with annual review. Please confirm how long prices must be held for? Are we able to negotiate price at the end of each 12 month period?
You must state your price for each year of the contract at the inception of the BPA.
- 2) Under NaDCC Packaging requirements it states ‘full oak heat treated wooden pallet’. In our opinion it is not economical (or sustainable!) to use Oak pallets, please therefore confirm whether you accept ISPM15 Heat Treated softwood pallets, which are the standard pallets used for transporting these products?
USAID/OFDA will accept ISPM15 Heat Treated softwood pallets so long as they are appropriate for transport per manufacturer’s recommendation and can withstand the minimum number of movements as indicated in the solicitation.
- 3) The colour of the bladder tank request is white. The standard colour supplied to the sector is yellow / sand coloured. Would USAID accept this colour as it would increase our ability to stock equipment and reduce lead times and pricing.
Yes, a standard yellow bladder is acceptable.
- 4) USAID require a printed logo on each tank. For the same reasons as stated above, would USAID accept stickers or a separate logo to be provided with each kit?
The printed log is required per solicitation. The offeror may, however, include the sticker as an optional item and indicate the difference in lead time and pricing.
- 5) The specification provided seems to be based on an old UNICEF specification – As a current LTA holder with UNICEF we can confirm this is now slightly different. Would USAID accept compliance with the current UNICEF specification which differs slightly in a few areas or are the values stated simply guidelines and minor differences will be considered by USAID?
The examples provided are all acceptable minor differences. However, the provided specifications should not be viewed merely as guidelines and proposed changes must be clearly highlighted and justified.

Examples:

DIN EN ISO 2286-2 has superseded DIN 53352
Weight is now listed as 930g/m² not 932g /m²
Temperature resistance lower limit is -30 not -35

- 6) Will USAID accept minor alternations in the Tapstand specification if bidders can show compliance regarding quality and performance and that the specification is already widely accepted by WASH NGOs?
Yes, provided equal performance and quality can be clearly demonstrated and products have been thoroughly tested or used in emergency field conditions.
- 7) With reference to question 4, the taps requested are different to our well known tap. Will USAID accept other tap options where performance and quality can be shown? Again, these will save in lead time and costs.
Yes, provided equal performance and quality can be clearly demonstrated and products have been thoroughly tested or used in emergency field conditions.
- 8) 2 spanners for Guillemin couplings are requested in the a) bladder connection accessories b) the connection kit and c) in the installation tool kit, please can you confirm if total 6 are required or if only 2 are required for the whole item.
Only 2 are required for the whole item. However, the water bladders are a distinct item from the water distribution kits and water treatment units. Each of these items must include separate tools as indicated in the specifications, as they will not always be deployed together.
- 9) If we believe we can reduce the quantities / nature of the installation tool kit but in no way detract from the ability to install, will USAID accept alternative specifications for this kit?
Yes, provided removed items do not detract from the ability to install the kit items. Removed duplicate items should be clearly highlighted and justified.
- 10) An identical connection kit is outlined for both the bladder kit (a) and the tapstand distribution kit (b). Please can you confirm both are required and these are not a duplication even though they are different kits.
Both are required, to ensure flexibility of connections in the field between (a) bladder kits, (b) tapstand distribution, and (c) emergency water treatment units.
- 11) Is the Bladder kit mentioned as component 2 of c) the water treatment unit to contain EVERYTHING listed in item a) including the installation tool kit?
Duplicate items which appear in the installation tool kit in a) and the site tool kit in c) do not have to be included twice. Likewise, duplicate fittings and connections in the bladder kit from a) do not have to be included twice in the water treatment unit. Removal of duplicate items must not detract from the ability to install or connect the kit items within the water treatment unit or to the bladder and distribution kits. Removed duplicate items should be clearly highlighted and justified.
- 12) Please can you confirm the acceptable currencies in which bids may be submitted?
Bids must be submitted in US\$.

- 13) To submit unchangeable fixed pricing for 5 years is either not possible or it would cause a large increase in price submitted because 5 years is a long time when material costs and currencies may fluctuate. Would USAID be prepared to accept annual pricing amendments within their BPA reviews (3.2) if there should be a certain % change in these two areas? If USAID are flexible in these areas then bidders will have less cause to increase pricing within bids to cover these risks (and ultimately deliver much greater value to USAID and your projects).

Bids must be priced for each year of the contract, at inception of the BPA. However price may be stated lower at the BPA Call but not higher than the price agreed upon at the BPA contract.

- 14) Do USAID have any figures to show the number of kits procured in the last 5 years. This will allow bidders to better estimate and predict stock levels and determine quantities for pricing. We understand that purchases over the last 5 years do not guarantee any number of requirements moving forwards. Nonetheless this information would be much appreciated and assist with setting out items in 5.3
- 15) **In the past 3 years USAID/OFDA purchased 73 Water Bladder Kits and 2 Water Treatment Units similar to those in the in the solicitation. In addition, USAID/OFDA used different Water Treatment systems in the past.**

How do we register on the SAM? Please could you send full text of the SAM and Instruction to Offerors and any further details of required registrations

Please go to www.sam.gov to register in the System for Award Management (SAM)

- 16) Please can USAID confirm MB limit for receiving emails. If submission is too large (given supporting documents) is submission possible via emailing a link to drop box (or similar) or would multiple (labelled) emails be acceptable.

Multiple emails may be submitted.

- 17) You have specified a PVC ground sheet. Would a high quality Geotextile groundsheet be acceptable?

Yes, provided equal performance and quality can be clearly demonstrated and products have been thoroughly tested or used in emergency field conditions. Protection of the bladder from punctures or damage is the primary function of the groundsheet.

- 18) You have specified stainless steel or high density polyethylene for the 2" inlet / outlet. Would either Aluminium or high quality Polypropylene also be acceptable?

Yes, provided equal performance and quality can be clearly demonstrated and products have been thoroughly tested or used in emergency field conditions. Performance and quality would be measured strength, durability, corrosivity, and weight.

- 19) You have specified 'bolted' flange ports – would screw fittings be acceptable. For Q2 & Q3 UNICEF currently accept our glass reinforced Polypropylene 2" inlets / outlets which are considered a quality screw fitting.

No.

20) You have specified 4" central port is to be HDPE. Would a high quality Moulded PVC port that is welded in place be acceptable? This is strong and suited for drinking water applications. It is currently accepted by UNICEF as their dosing port under our LTA.

Yes, provided equal performance and quality can be clearly demonstrated and products have been thoroughly tested or used in emergency field conditions.

21) You have specified the 4" central port is to be 3ft from the edge of the bladder. Because our tank is slightly higher and shorter than your specification, we would recommend the central port is situated in the centre of the tank. This is still accessible and improves performance. Is this acceptable?

Accessibility is the primary concern. The port should be centrally located along the short edge, and approximately 1.5 ft from the edge of the bladder when full (equivalent to the placement of a 1.5 ft high filled bladder with a port 3 ft from the edge.)

22) No Pressure Release Valve is requested within the 4" central port. Would a PRV be required? We would recommend this as a good indicator of overfilling and other operational maintenance.

A pressure release valve is not required, but is acceptable to be included.

23) Could you confirm if the pump in item c) is petrol or diesel? I believe the pump named as an example is diesel but the spec says petrol?

Confirmed that the pump in item c) is petrol.